



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,991	07/13/2001	Yuri Poeluev	06944.0042	2243

27155 7590 12/06/2006
MCCARTHY TETRAULT LLP
BOX 48, SUITE 4700,
66WELLINGTON STREET WEST
TORONTO, ON M5K 1E6
CANADA

EXAMINER

EL CHANTI, HUSSEIN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/903,991

Applicant(s)

POELUEV, YURI

Examiner

Hussein A. El-chanti

Art Unit

2157

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 4 and 12-19.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached:


REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant requests clarification regarding the "new grounds of rejection" in the final office action mailed on Sep. 8, 2006. In response, examiner clarifies that the claim amendments received on June 29, 2006 include new limitations that were not in the original claims. Therefore, the new limitations were rejected under new grounds of rejection in the final office action using the same reference. Therefore claim amendments necessitated the new grounds of rejection

Applicants arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues in substance that Boden does not disclose a software module at the host intercepting and modifying the DNS request and where the request is performed transparently. In response, Boden teaches a system including a VPN gateway 470 "public host" receives intercepting packets from Network A 462 "VPN". The gateway sends a gethostname() query to the DNS 468 "DNS of said VPN" and in response to the query, the gateway 470 receives an address of an address "domain name response" (see fig. 2 and col. 7 lines 18-67). Therefore, Boden teaches a VPN gateway "public host" intercepting packets from network A "VPN" and obtaining an address response by querying DNS 468 "DNS of said VPN". In addition, applicant argues that the steps are not performed transparently since the address translation rules are defined by the user. In response, examiner points out even though the user "initially" defines the address translation rules, the subsequent requests sent from a client on the private network are processed transparently in the manner described above without any user intervention which makes the process "transparent".

The applicant is reminded that the claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. The claim language fails to clearly recite that the public host is actually the "client machine". Examiner believes that amendment to the "public host" to specify that the public host is the client machine would clearly define the scope of the claimed limitation and possibly overcome the cited prior art..



YVES DALENCOURT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100